

DATE: 21/11/28	BY: 029
----------------	---------

SEP 29 1954

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Colonel White

SUBJECT :

Comments on Item #4 of Attached Agenda for the
CIA Career Council

1. Proposal: To increase the number of JOT slots from the present 60 to 150. (As originally established, the JOT Program was predicated on 150 slots, but the other uses to which these slots have been put, i.e., Career Development, JCD, etc., have reduced the number from 150 to 60).

2. Comments: The reasons behind this proposal are actually more interesting than the proposal itself. Briefly, the reasoning is this: since the main problem of getting increased attendance at OTR courses is the question of availability, Matt Baird feels that by staffing his JOT Program up to strength he will, in effect, create a manpower pool of people who can be "given" to divisions as an inducement to release some of the people presently being denied training because their shops "cannot spare them."

3. Availability has always been a hair shirt in the experience I have had with the Agency, across the board in fact, but the strongest resistance has traditionally come from the DD/P area, where the doctrine of "operational necessity" has been used too often as a gimmick to conceal flaws in personnel and training management. There are many times when to release a man for something that is as much a long term investment as training would work a hardship on the affected office, but I think there are infinitely more times when such a release would merely be a nuisance, since it would force a reallocation of the work load.

4. In addition, I cannot escape the feeling that this proposal might considerably reduce the basic effectiveness of the JOT Program as an instrument through which carefully selected people are trained and assigned within the Agency on the basis of matching their talents, aptitudes and interests with assignments that not only promote their value to the Agency but which maintain their interest in CIA as a place where they should make their careers. If the JOTs are to be used solely as dike-pluggers, on a willy-nilly, haphazard program of "assignment to whatever division wants a body to replace someone for training," I think that you would undermine the reasoning under which the Program was started in the first place. We should be doing everything we can to make the JOT Program a stable operation where a capable young man or woman can go through predicted training and careful assignment directed toward proper eventual placement. This is exactly what industry is selling these same young people, and if we get them in the net and then merely exploit them after training under the doctrine of "necessity" it will not be long before the sources become aware that we are operating a shell game.

142
up

-2-

5. Also, to my knowledge there has never been a time in the history of the JOT Program when either their civilian or military slots have been filled, even when the former number experienced gradual reduction. It was not solely because of "superior selection" by the JOT Division that this was so; the candidates simply did not show up in numbers sufficient to give OTR the selections spread they thought was necessary.

6. As far as the business of how the "sources for these candidates have been appreciably expanded, I say that this is purely relative. In 1951-52, the JOT Program set for itself a goal of 50 participating colleges and universities. Over three years, 1951-54, the tedious process of selection, clearance and indoctrination has finally given Personnel exactly 35 colleges and universities at which we have cleared representatives. There are 4 other schools where the representatives have been cleared but have not been into Washington for indoctrination and polygraph. Thus, three years after the first modest goal was set, we are still 10 colleges under the original target. The present theoretical goal is somewhere around 75 colleges and universities, but there is a real question about candidates and about funds to pay them for their services, since the costs of administering the JOT Program were long ago transferred from Training's budget to that of Personnel, which has other uses for this money.

7. What I have said in paragraph 6, above, about the number of consultants and sources has another side: suppose that the proposal is passed and that the number of slots goes up to 150. The capacity, or capability of the Office of Personnel to recruit these additional candidates is lower today than at any time in the past three years. In February of 1952, there were 43 professional recruitment officers (not including clerical recruiters) to mine the sources then available. As of today, Personnel Procurement has exactly 8 professional recruiters (not including clerical recruiters) in the field, including one normally assigned locally. Even this figure of 8 is 2 less than authorized, but the simple fact is that field recruitment gets progressively less attractive to the recruiter, and the division has not been able to hold onto its more experienced men for very long. In February, 1952, Personnel Procurement had 124 people; today it has 36 in all. As recently as September, 1953 there were 26 professional field recruiters against today's 8. It is then one thing to have sources and another thing to mine them with next to nothing in the way of recruiters. I think it would be academic to increase the slots to 150 at this time; it might as well go to 350, except for the fact that I believe that in time these additional slots will end up being diverted to other uses after they have remained unoccupied for so long a time.

8. SUMMARY: (1) I have serious doubts about the ability of the Agency to fill the present JOT quota, not to mention one over twice as large, without considerable relief in the form of new recruiters. (2) Although both DD/P and OTR have reasons for supporting this proposal, each reason different, I am afraid that to use JOTs in the manner proposed might well impair its long-term usefulness, by making of it a

CONFIDENTIAL

-3-

source of "cheap labor" to be exploited at will with no responsibility either in DD/P or OTR for the kind of "developmental training on the job" that was the heart of the original JOT Program plan. (3) I am sure that Matt's statement that "in a considerable number of instances. . . JOTs constitute suitable replacements for employees. . . up to the GS-13 level" has not been concurred in by Personnel, for if it had, Personnel would be igniting the fuse that led to the charge under their own Classification Structure. Also, I have considerable reservations about the wisdom of taking a GS-7 JOT and putting him into a GS-12 or 13 job. In the first place, it handicaps the JOT too severely, and prevents a true evaluation of his worth, and secondly, if the JOT learns, as he must, that he is being paid \$4205 a year to do a job that Personnel thinks is worth \$8360 a year, it will not take long for him to realize that he is "being had," with consequent damage to his morale.

Finally though, I do agree that to simply reject this proposal without offering something else is merely to ignore the problem. DD/P needs the training OTR can offer, and OTR needs to more fully utilize their fixed overhead. What the present proposal needs is: a more modest goal than the 150 slots proposed, and additional internal controls to insure that the Program does not deteriorate as outlined in (2) of paragraph 8 above. Lastly, I think that the recruitment force needs more support. An inexpensive program to beef up the recruitment force to meet crash needs was furnished to AD/P over my signature more than a year ago, but it has never been acknowledged or implemented. However, it is still on record in the Office of Personnel and might prove helpful. Without some form of relief in the procurement field, I cannot see how Matt's proposal can mean anything, except that it will increase DD/P's expectations and add to AD/P's frustrations.

25X1A9a



CONFIDENTIAL